

### **REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1 and 5 and various paragraphs of the specification have been amended solely for the purposes of informality correction, better wording and clarification. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 5 are independent claims. These amendments are not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant does not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least at page 8, line 20 through page 9, line 3 and at page 10, line 10 through page 11, line 3.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,552,703 issued to Ushigusa ("Ushigusa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,726,677 issued to Imamura ("Imamura"). This rejection is rendered moot in light of the amendments to claims 1 and 5. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1 and 5 are patentable over Ushigusa and Imamura for at least the following reasons.

Assuming *arguendo* that the references may be combined and a reasonable expectation of success exists, the combined references do not disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. Specifically, amended claim 1 recites *inter alia*:

said column driving circuit controls a current flowing in said data electrodes such that the current through said data electrodes is proportional to the number of simultaneously driven scanning electrodes

Similarly, amended claim 5 recites *inter alia*:

controlling the current flowing in said data electrodes such that the current through said data electrodes is proportional to the number of simultaneously driven scanning electrodes

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Ushigusa nor Imamura, alone or in combination disclose at least such features. Rather, Ushigusa teaches that to adjust luminance levels of light emitting devices, “the level of the voltage across the device at the time of the light emission is set to a constant value (that is, the constant instantaneous luminance and constant driving current of the device) and a connecting time of a driving source to the anode line is changed within a range of the scanning period of time...” (col. 5, lines 28-33, emphasis added). In other words, Ushigusa’s driving circuit changes the length of time that a constant driving current is applied to the light emitting devices to adjust the luminance of each device. (see Fig. 7, col. 5, lines 36-46). Hence, Ushigusa does not teach or suggest at least a “current flowing in said data electrodes such that the current through said data electrodes is proportional to the number of simultaneously driven scanning electrodes.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 5. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 5, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Claims 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ushigusa in view of Imamura, as applied to claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,026 issued to Saito et al. ("Saito"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Ushigusa and Imamura, and Saito fails to cure the deficiencies of Ushigusa and Imamura noted above with regard to claim 1.

Accordingly, claims 2 and 4 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 2 and 4.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: October 20, 2006

**H.C. Park & Associates, PLC**  
8500 Leesburg Pike  
Suite 7500  
Vienna, VA 22182  
Tel: 703-288-5105  
Fax: 703-288-5139  
HCP/RTS/tmk